

REMARKS

This application represents the U.S. National Phase of International Application No. PCT/EP01/06589. In the office action dated July 13, 2004, the Examiner (1) objected to the drawings; (2) objected to the specification; and (3) rejected claims 1-22 as obvious over prior art. The following remarks address each of these matters in turn.

1. Drawings

As shown in red on the Replacement Sheets contained in Appendix C, Applicant has amended Figs. 1, 3 and 4 to add descriptive labels as requested by the Examiner. Approval is requested.

2. Specification

Applicant has amended the specification as shown in Appendix B to add appropriate section headings. In addition, applicant has added some text to paragraph 0001 that provides a little more specificity to the Field of the Invention. Further, some additional background material has been added to the Background section. Each of these additions is fully supported in the original specification, and no “new matter” has been added.

3. Rejection of Claims

The Examiner rejected claims 1-22 under 35 USC 103(a) as obvious over U.S. Patent No. 5,903,721 (Sixtus) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,890,161 (Helland). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Contrary to the assertion by the Examiner, the combination of Sixtus with Helland does not teach or suggest a method for executing an online transaction wherein the vendor computer includes both a catalog server and a separate transaction server. Sixtus' patent is directed to a secure method to authenticate a user that has sent a request for an online transaction to a vendor catalog. As the Examiner acknowledges (*see* Paper No. 4. at p. 5), Sixtus does not disclose a method and system for an online transaction whereby the computer system includes a catalog server. For example, Fig. 4b of Sixtus makes clear that the “Purchaser-Client” sends his transaction request to the same vendor server, and not to a separate catalog server. However, the Examiner cites Helland as disclosing a catalog server, and suggests that it would be obvious to combine Helland with Sixtus to arrive at the present invention. *Id.* Applicant respectfully disagrees.

First, Helland does not disclose a separate catalog server. The Examiner cited Helland at Col. 11:64-67 and Fig. 3 in support of his assertion. *Id.* However, the cited passage clearly indicates that the attributes are stored in the transaction server, not in a separate catalog server. The “transaction server catalog” described in Helland “is a configuration database that stores the attributes of the server application component In an alternative embodiment, these attributes can be stored as “meta data” in the component itself” (Helland at Col. 11:67 – Col. 12:7) Thus, there is no separate server, but merely a storage unit, and in the alternative embodiment, the attribute data is stored as part of the component. Fig. 2 clearly illustrates that the transaction server catalog 136 is part of the server computer, not a separate server.

All of the independent claims (1, 2, 3, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19) include a catalog server. Thus, based on a lack of this element in either of the cited references, applicant submits that all of the independent claims are patentable over the cited combination. For the same reasons, the dependent claims are also patentable.

In asserting that the combination of Sixtus and Helland makes the present claims obvious, the Examiner refers to the following portions of Sixtus: col. 3:28-43; col. 3:50-60; col. 4:1-10; col. 7:45-47; col. 7:60-66; col. 8:1-5; and col. 9:25-31; and the following portions of Helland: col. 4:1-3; and col. 11:64-67. However, these portions do not support the Examiner’s assertions.

For example, col. 3 lines 28-43 and lines 50-60 of Sixtus does not teach or suggest how transaction-relevant data are transmitted from a catalog server to a transaction server, nor does it teach or suggest that object ID’s are assigned to the objects identifying the objects. In fact, Sixtus describes in col. 3 a process of user authentication involving communication between the vendor server and a so-called trust server, whereby the vendor computer sends a “transaction verification request” to the trust server in order to authenticate the user.

Likewise, col. 4 lines 1-5 of Sixtus does not teach or suggest how selected objects including object attributes are received at a transaction server from a catalog server. Also, col. 4 lines 1-10 of Sixtus does not teach or suggest how object attributes are transmittable from the catalog server to a transaction server without client interaction. In fact, the cited portion describes user authentication.

Col. 7 lines 60-66 of Sixtus does not teach or suggest that URL that also contains a command for executing a specific process on the transaction server, nor does it teach or suggest a method wherein the selection of an object by a user initiates a transfer of the ID to the URL of the transaction server. Further, Sixtus does not teach or suggest that the response to the user’s request

can be transmitted in different formats like XML, WML etc. Instead, Sixtus describes a simple request to be sent to a server that is processed by a web browser.

In Col. 8, lines 1-5, Sixtus discloses the so called "user client module" which assembles a request message for transmitting to the vendor computer. This "user client module" is not necessary for the methods and systems that are described and claimed in the present application.

In col. 9 lines 29-30, Sixtus does not teach or suggest how the object attributes are transmitted from a catalog server directly to a transaction server. Sixtus again refers to the "user client module" that "assembles a request message for transmitting to the vendor computer." As mentioned above, this "user client module" is not necessary for the methods and systems that are described and claimed in the present application. Further, the transaction request message is sent to the same vendor computer where the user has selected the respective item for the transaction. For that reason, applicant submits that Sixtus does not teach or suggest a method of how the data that are relevant for the transaction are transmitted from one server to another.

As noted above, Helland does not disclose a "catalog server" as it is described in the present application. The "transaction server catalog" described in Helland is not comparable with the "catalog server" described and claimed in the present application. Actually, the "transaction server catalog" is a kind of repository where the so-called "server application components" are registered.

For all the foregoing reasons, applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and requests reconsideration to that end. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned if additional issues remain.

Respectfully submitted,

DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP

Dated: 10/13/04

By: 
Richard A. Nebb
Reg. No. 33,540

Please send all correspondence to:
Dergosits & Noah LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Suite 1450
San Francisco, California 94111
(415) 705-6377

Attorney Ref. 376.11